

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
08/962,700

Applicant(s)  
J. Michael Caldwell

Examiner  
Jerry A. Lorengo

Group Art Unit  
1734



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Jerry A. Lorengo

(3) David. Heisey - Reg. No. 42,651

(2) Charles Berkman

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview May 5, 2000

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1

Identification of prior art discussed:

U.S. Patent No. 3,265,529 to Caldwell et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

The applicant's representatives and the examiner focused primarily upon two points: 1) how much weight the workpiece limitation "shear-thinable" should be given in evaluating the apparatus; and 2) the applicant's use and definition of the word "encapsulating" in the claims. The examiner's position was that "shear-thinable" was an inherent property of almost all polymers and the apparatus of Caldwell et al. would be capable of performing such a function and that the apparatus of Caldwell et al. was also capable of encapsulating (coating and filling) the fibers of a textile web when a polymer composition was applied by shear-thinning. The applicant's disagreed that almost all polymers were shear thinnable and also with the examiner's understanding of the word "encapsulation", pointing to the applicant's definition of "encapsulation" as set forth in the specification. Both parties agreed that these arguments should be expanded in an official response to the office action and be evaluated by the examiner and his SPE.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.